arXiv:1610.03339v1 [math.DG] 11 Oct 2016

SECTIONAL AND INTERMEDIATE RICCI CURVATURE LOWER BOUNDS VIA OPTIMAL TRANSPORT

CHRISTIAN KETTERER AND ANDREA MONDINO

Abstract. The goal of the paper is to give an optimal transport characterization of lower sectional curvature bounds for smooth n-dimensional Riemannian manifolds. More generally we characterize, via optimal transport, lower (and, in some cases, upper) bounds on the so called p-Ricci curvature which corresponds to taking the trace of the Riemann curvature tensor on p-dimensional planes, $1 \leq p \leq n$. Such characterization roughly consists on a convexity condition of the p-Reny entropy along L^2-Wasserstein geodesics, where the role of reference measure is played by the p-dimensional Hausdorff measure. As application we establish a new Brunn-Minkowski type inequality involving p-dimensional submanifolds and the p-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

1. introduction

The interplay between Ricci curvature and optimal transport is well known and it has been a topic of tremendous interest in the last years. On the other hand it seems to be still an open problem to find the link between sectional curvature bounds (and more generally intermediate Ricci curvature bounds) and optimal transportation. The goal of the paper is to address such a question.

Inspired by the pioneering work on Ricci curvature lower bounds via optimal transport by Sturm and von Renesse [18], later extended to non-smooth spaces in the foundational works of Lott-Villani [9] and Sturm [16, 17], we analyze convexity properties of the p-Reny entropy along L^2-Wasserstein geodesics, where the role of the reference measure is played here by the p-dimensional Hausdorff measure. In a first approximation, one can think of studying the convexity of the p-Reny entropy along an L^2-Wasserstein geodesic made of probability measures concentrated on p-dimensional submanifolds of M (this will actually be the starting point of our investigation, see Section 3).
The study of optimal transportation between measures supported on arbitrary submanifolds in an arbitrary Riemannian manifold seems to be quite a new topic in the literature. Nevertheless several authors treated remarkable particular cases and related questions:

- Gangbo-McCann [5] proved results about optimal transport between measures supported on hyper-surfaces in Euclidean space;
- McCann-Sosio [11] and Kitagawa-Warren [7] gave more refined results about optimal transport between two measures supported on a codimension one sphere in Euclidean space;
- Castillon [2] considered optimal transport between a measure supported on a submanifold of Euclidean space and a measure supported on a linear subspace;
- Lott [8] characterized the tangent cone (in the W_2-metric) to a probability measure supported on a smooth submanifold of a Riemannian manifold.

In order to state the results let us introduce some notation (for more details see Section 2). Let (M^n, g) be a smooth, complete, n-dimensional Riemannian manifold. For $p = \{1, \dots, n\}$, denote by $\mathcal{H}^p$ the p-dimensional Hausdorff measure and consider the space $\mathcal{P}_c(X, \mathcal{H}^p)$ of probability measures with compact support which are absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{H}^p$. Given $1 \leq p \leq p' < \infty$, the p'-Reny entropy

Key words and phrases. Sectional curvature, intermediate Ricci curvature, Optimal Transport, Brunn-Minkowski inequality.

C. Ketterer: Freiburg University, Mathematics Department, email: christian.ketterer@math.uni-freiburg.de.
A. Mondino: The University of Warwick, Mathematics Institute, email: A.Mondino@warwick.ac.uk.

with respect to $\mathcal{H}^p$ is defined as

$$S_{p'}(\cdot|\mathcal{H}^p) : \mathcal{P}_c(X, \mathcal{H}^p) \to [-\infty, 0], \quad S_{p'}(\mu|\mathcal{H}^p) = -\int \rho^{1-\frac{1}{p'}} d\mathcal{H}^p,$$

where ρ is the density of μ with respect to $\mathcal{H}^p$, i.e. $\mu = \rho\mathcal{H}^p$. Note that in the borderline case $p' = p = 1$, one gets

$$S_1(\mu|\mathcal{H}^1) = -\mathcal{H}^1(\mathrm{supp}(\mu)).$$

Also, the (relative) Shannon entropy is defined by

$$\mathrm{Ent}(\cdot|\mathcal{H}^p) : \mathcal{P}_c(X, \mathcal{H}^p) \to [-\infty, \infty], \quad \mathrm{Ent}(\mu|\mathcal{H}^p) = \int_X \rho \log \rho \, d\mathcal{H}^p.$$

Recall also the definition of the volume-distortion coefficients. Given two numbers $K, N \in \mathbb{R}$ with $N \geq 1$, we set for $(t, \theta) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\sigma^{(t)}_{K,N}(\theta) := \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } K\theta^2 \geq N\pi^2, \\ \dfrac{\sin(t\theta\sqrt{K/N})}{\sin(\theta\sqrt{K/N})} & \text{if } 0 < K\theta^2 < N\pi^2, \\ t & \text{if } K\theta^2 < 0 \text{ and } N = 0, \text{ or if } K\theta^2 = 0, \\ \dfrac{\sinh(t\theta\sqrt{-K/N})}{\sinh(\theta\sqrt{-K/N})} & \text{if } K\theta^2 \leq 0 \text{ and } N > 0. \end{cases}$$

Our main result concerning sectional curvature lower bounds, is the following theorem. In order to state it, recall that a subset $\Sigma \subset M$ is said to be countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable if, up to a $\mathcal{H}^p$-negligible subset, it can be covered by countably many p-dimensional Lipschitz submanifolds.

Theorem 1.1 (Characterization of sectional curvature lower bounds via OT)**.** *Let (M, g) be a complete n-dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary and fix $K \in \mathbb{R}$.*

- *If $K \geq 0$ the next three conditions are equivalent:*
  - (i) *M has sectional curvature bounded from below by K, i.e.* $\mathrm{Sec} \geq K$.
  - (ii) *Let $p \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ and consider $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ with $\mu_i = \rho_i \mathcal{H}^p$. Assume there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ between μ_0 and μ_1 such that for some $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0} \subset M$. Then $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \Sigma_t \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$ for a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_t \subset M$, and it holds*

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p) \leq -\int \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{(p-1)K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x, y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{(p-1)K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x, y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\right] d\pi(x, y), \ \forall t \in [0, 1],$$

    for all $p' \geq p$, where π is the optimal coupling induced by the W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$.
  - (iii) *Let $p \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ and consider $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$. Assume there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ between μ_0 and μ_1 such that for some $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0} \subset M$. Then $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \Sigma_t \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$ for a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_t \subset M$ and it holds*

$$\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p) \leq (1 - t)\,\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_0|\mathcal{H}^p) + t\,\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_1|\mathcal{H}^p) - \frac{K}{2}t(1 - t)W_2^2(\mu_0, \mu_1), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

- *If $K \leq 0$ the next three conditions are equivalent:*
  - (i) *M has sectional curvature bounded from below by K, i.e.* $\mathrm{Sec} \geq K$.
  - (ii) *Let $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and consider $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ with $\mu_i = \rho_i \mathcal{H}^p$. Assume there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ between μ_0 and μ_1 such that for some $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0} \subset M$. Then $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \Sigma_t \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$ for a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_t \subset M$, and it holds*

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p) \leq -\int \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{\bar{K},p'}(\mathsf{d}(x, y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{\bar{K},p'}(\mathsf{d}(x, y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\right] d\pi(x, y), \ \forall t \in [0, 1],$$

    for all $p' \geq p$, where $\bar{K} := \min\{p, n - 1\}K$ and π is the optimal coupling induced by the W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$.

(iii) *Let $p \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ and consider $\mu_0,\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$. Assume there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ between μ_0 and μ_1 such that for some $t_0\in(0,1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0}\subset M$. Then $\mu_t=\rho_t\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ for every $t\in[0,1]$ for a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_t\subset M$ and it holds*

$$\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p)\le(1-t)\,\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_0|\mathcal{H}^p)+t\,\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_1|\mathcal{H}^p)-\frac{K}{2}t(1-t)W_2^2(\mu_0,\mu_1),\quad\forall t\in[0,1].$$

Theorem 1.1 is actually a particular case of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 where we characterize lower bounds on the p-Ricci curvature in terms of optimal transport, for any $p\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. For the rigorous definition and basic properties on the p-Ricci curvature we refer to Section 2, here let us just mention the intuitive idea behind: in the standard Ricci curvature (corresponding in this notation to the n-Ricci curvature), one considers the trace of the Riemann curvature tensor along all the tangent space to M at some point $x\in M$, while in the p-Ricci curvature one considers the trace of the Riemann curvature tensor just along p-dimensional subspaces. The notion of p-Ricci curvature has already been considered in the literature, in particular in connection with topological results (see for instance the works of Wu [21], Shen [15], Wilhelm [20], Petersen-Wilhelm [13] and Xu-Ye [22]). Just to fix the ideas, let us recall that if the sectional curvature is bounded below by $K\ge0$, then the p-Ricci curvature is bounded below by $(p-1)K$; if instead the sectional curvature is bounded below by $K\le0$, then the p-Ricci curvature is bounded below by $\min\{p,n-1\}K$.

As application of our results we establish a new Brunn-Minkowski type inequality involving the $\mathcal{H}^p$-measure (instead of the standard volume measure). For the precise statement corresponding to lower sectional curvature bounds see Corollary 5.3.

Theorem 1.2 (p-Brunn-Minkowski Inequality)**.** *Let (M,g) be a complete n-dimensional Riemannian manifold and assume that the p-Ricci curvature is bounded below by K, for some $p\in\{1,\dots,n\}$ and $K\in\mathbb{R}$. Let $A_0,A_1\subset M$ be bounded p-rectifiable subsets with positive and finite $\mathcal{H}^p$-measure. Set $\mu_i=\mathcal{H}^p(A_i)^{-1}\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner A_i$ for $i=0,1$ and assume that there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ such that for some $t_0\in(0,1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable subset $\Sigma_{t_0}\subset M$.*

Then for every $t\in[0,1]$ one has $\mu_t=\rho_t\mathcal{H}^p\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ and it holds

$$\mathcal{H}^p\left(\{\rho_t>0\}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\ge\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\,\mathcal{H}^p(A_0)^{\frac{1}{p'}}+\sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\,\mathcal{H}^p(A_1)^{\frac{1}{p'}},\quad\forall p'\ge p,$$

where

$$\Theta:=\begin{cases}\inf\{\mathsf{d}(x,y):x\in A_0,y\in A_1\} & \text{if } K\ge0,\\ \sup\{\mathsf{d}(x,y):x\in A_0,y\in A_1\} & \text{if } K<0.\end{cases}$$

In particular, calling

$$A_t:=\{\gamma(t)\,:\,\gamma\in\mathrm{Geo}(X),\,\gamma(0)\in A_0,\,\gamma(1)\in A_1\}$$

the set of all t-intermediate points of geodesics with endpoints in A_0 and A_1, it holds

$$\mathcal{H}^p(A_t)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\ge\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\,\mathcal{H}^p(A_0)^{\frac{1}{p'}}+\sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\,\mathcal{H}^p(A_1)^{\frac{1}{p'}},\quad\forall p'\ge p.$$

Remark 1.3 (Some bits of history about the Brunn-Minkowski inequality). In case the ambient space is $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $p=n$, the inequality was first established by Brunn in the end of nineteenth century (for convex sets in dimension 2 and 3), then generalized by Minkowski (for convex sets in arbitrary dimension) and by Lusternik (for general compact sets). The possibility of proving Brunn-Minkowski inequality via a change of variable is classical. It has been McCann in his PhD thesis [10] to notice that the use of optimal transport leads to a natural choice of reparametrization. Using an optimal-transport approach, Cordero-Erausquin-McCann-Schmuckenschläger [4] established then a curved version of Brunn-Minkowski inequality in an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold with lower Ricci curvature bounds (and still $p=n$), extended then by Sturm [17] to metric measure spaces and by Ohta [12] to Finsler geometries.

Let us stress that in all the aforementioned references one always considers the (top-dimensional) volume measure, the novelty of Theorem 1.2 being that we consider sets of positive co-dimension and the

Hausdorff measure of the corresponding codimension. To the best of our knowledge this generalization has not appeared in literature yet, even in case the ambient space is $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we settle the notation and discuss some preliminaries. In Section 3, as motivation to our main results, we study first the case where the L^2-Wasserstein geodesic is concentrated on smooth p-dimensional submanifolds and is driven by a smooth Kantorovich potential. Then in Section 4 we state and prove our main results characterizing p-Ricci lower bounds in terms of optimal transportation, and finally in Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.2 and a p-Bishop-Gromov inequality involving p-dimensional disks in an n-dimensional ambient space. We also discuss some non-smooth extensions and open problems.

Acknowledgement: Most of the work was done while both authors were in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California during the Spring 2016 semester, supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1440140. We thank the organizers of the Differential Geometry Program and MSRI for providing great environment for research and collaboration.

2. Preliminaries

Optimal transport and Wasserstein geometry. It is out of the scopes of this short section to give a comprehensive introduction to optimal transport, for this purpose we refer to [1] and [19]. Instead, we will be satisfied by recalling those notions and results that we will use throughout the paper.

Let (X, d) be a complete, separable and proper metric space. A curve $\gamma : [0,1] \to X$ is said to be a (length-minimizing, constant speed) geodesic if

$$\mathsf{d}(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = |s-t|\ \mathsf{d}(\gamma(0), \gamma(1)), \quad \forall s, t \in [0,1].$$

We denote by $\mathrm{Geo}(X) := \{\gamma : [0,1] \to X \text{ s.t. } \gamma \text{ is a geodesic}\}$ the family of geodesics equipped with the L^∞-topology. The evaluation map $\mathrm{e}_t : \mathrm{Geo}(X) \to X$ is given by $\mathrm{e}_t(\gamma) = \gamma(t)$, and it is clearly continuous.

$\mathcal{P}_c(X)$ denotes the space of Borel probability measures with compact support and $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ denotes the space of Borel probability measures μ with finite second moment, i.e. satisfying $\int_X \mathsf{d}^2(x, x_0)\, d\mu(x) < \infty$ for some (and thus for any) $x_0 \in X$.
The space $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ is naturally endowed with the L^2-Wasserstein distance W_2 defined by

$$W_2(\mu_1, \mu_2)^2 := \inf \left\{ \int_{X\times X} \mathsf{d}^2(x,y) d\pi(x,y) \ \text{ s.t. } \pi \in \mathrm{Cpl}(\mu_1, \mu_2) \right\},$$

where $\mathrm{Cpl}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is the family of all coupling between μ_1 and μ_2, i.e. of all the probability measures $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(X^2)$ such that $(P_i)_\sharp \pi = \mu_i$, $i = 1, 2$, P_1, P_2 being the projection maps. $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$ becomes a separable metric space that is a geodesic metric space provided X is a geodesic metric space.

A coupling $\pi \in \mathrm{Cpl}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is optimal if

$$\int_{X^2} \mathsf{d}(x,y)^2 d\pi(x,y) = W_2(\mu_1, \mu_2)^2.$$

Optimal couplings always exist, and if an optimal coupling π is induced by a map $T : Z \to X$ via $(T, \mathrm{id}_X)_\sharp \mu_1 = \pi$, where Z is a measurable subset of X, we say that T is an optimal map. A probability measure $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{Geo}(X))$ is called an optimal dynamical coupling or plan if $(\mathrm{e}_0, \mathrm{e}_1)_\sharp \Pi$ is an optimal coupling between the initial and final marginal distributions.

In the present paper, a key role is played by the subspace $\mathcal{P}_2(X, \mathcal{H}^p) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ made of probability measures that are absolutely continuous with respect to the p-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^p$. We also denote with $\mathcal{P}_c(X, \mathcal{H}^p) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X, \mathcal{H}^p)$ the subspace of absolutely continuous probability measures with compact support.

In the introduction, for simplicity, we defined the entropy functionals for compactly supported probability measures; the definitions carry over probability measures with finite second moment, let us briefly recall

them. Given $1 \le p \le p' < \infty$, the p'-Reny entropy with respect to the p-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^p$ is defined as

$$S_{p'}(\cdot|\mathcal{H}^p) : \mathcal{P}_2(X, \mathcal{H}^p) \to [-\infty, 0], \quad S_{p'}(\mu|\mathcal{H}^p) = -\int \rho^{1-\frac{1}{p'}} d\mathcal{H}^p,$$

where ρ is the density of μ with respect to $\mathcal{H}^p$, i.e. $\mu = \rho\mathcal{H}^p$. Notice that, by Jensen's inequality, we have

$$[-\infty, 0] \ni -\big(\mathcal{H}^p(\operatorname{supp}\mu)\big)^{1/p'} \le S_{p'}(\mu|\mathcal{H}^p).$$

In particular if ρ is concentrated on a set of finite $\mathcal{H}^p$-measure then $S_{p'}(\mu|\mathcal{H}^p)$ is finite. Note that in the borderline case $p' = p = 1$, one gets

$$S_1(\mu|\mathcal{H}^1) = -\mathcal{H}^1(\operatorname{supp}(\mu)).$$

Finally, the (relative) Shannon entropy is defined by

$$\operatorname{Ent}(\cdot|\mathcal{H}^p) : \mathcal{P}_2(X, \mathcal{H}^p) \to [-\infty, \infty], \quad \operatorname{Ent}(\mu|\mathcal{H}^p) = \int_X \rho \log \rho \, d\mathcal{H}^p.$$

Rectifiable sets. Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}, m \le n$. We say that Σ is countably m-rectifiable if there is a countable family of Lipschitz maps $f_i : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$, such that $E \subset \bigcup_i f_i(\mathbb{R}^m)$. The set R is countably $\mathcal{H}^m$-rectifiable if there is a countably m-rectifiable set $\Sigma' \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathcal{H}^m(\Sigma \backslash \Sigma') = 0$.
As it is well known, using Whitney extension Theorem, it is possible to show that a subset $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is countably $\mathcal{H}^m$-rectifiable if and only if there exists a sequence of m-dimensional C^1-submanifolds $\{S_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^m\Big(\Sigma \backslash \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} S_i\Big) = 0.$$

Clearly, by considering local coordinates (or by Nash isometric embedding Theorem), one can define the same notions for subsets of an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold.

Intermediate Ricci curvature. Let (M, g) be an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold and let

$$R : TM \times TM \times TM \to TM, \quad R(X, Y)Z := \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - \nabla_X \nabla_Y Z + \nabla_{[X,Y]} Z$$

the Riemannian curvature tensor (of course ∇ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of (M, g) and $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denotes the Lie bracket). Sometimes we will use the notation $|v| := \sqrt{g(v, v)}$ and $\langle v, w\rangle := g(v, w)$. Using the standard notation, T_xM is the tangent space of M at the point $x \in M$. For a 2-plane $P \subset T_xM$ spanned by $v, w \in T_xM$, let

$$\operatorname{Sec}(P) = \operatorname{Sec}(v, w) := \frac{g(R(v, w)v, w)}{|v|^2|w|^2 - \langle v, w\rangle^2}$$

be the sectional curvature. Recall that, given $w \in T_xM$, the Ricci curvature $\operatorname{Ric}(w, w)$ is defined by

$$\operatorname{Ric}(w, w) := \operatorname{tr}\left[R(w, \cdot)w\right].$$

Definition 2.1 (p-Ricci Curvature)**.** Let $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. For a p-dimensional plane P in T_xM and a vector $w \in T_xM$, we define the p-Ricci curvature of P in the direction of w as

$$\operatorname{Ric}_p(P, w) := \operatorname{tr}\left[\big(R(w, \cdot)w\big)|_P\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \operatorname{Sec}(e_i, w)(|w|^2 - \langle e_i, w\rangle^2), \tag{1}$$

where $e_1, \dots, e_p$ is an orthonormal basis of P.

Note that, in particular, if $|w| = 1$ and w is orthogonal to P then

$$\operatorname{Ric}_p(P, w) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \operatorname{Sec}(e_i, w).$$

It is standard to check that Ric_p is well-defined and independent of the choice of a basis for P. Notice also that, if $w \notin P$, then

$$\mathrm{Ric}_p(P,w) = \mathrm{Ric}_{p+1}(\mathrm{span}(P,w),w) = \mathrm{Ric}_p(\mathrm{span}(P,w)\cap w^\perp, w) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mathrm{Sec}(e_i,w)|w|^2, \tag{2}$$

where $\{e_i\}_{i=1,\dots,p}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathrm{span}(P,w)\cap w^\perp$, $w^\perp \subset T_xM$ being the orthogonal subspace to w.

Definition 2.2 (p-Ricci upper and lower bounds)**.** We say that (M,g) has p-Ricci curvature bounded from below (resp. from above) by K if, for any $x \in M$ and any p-dimensional plane $P \subset T_xM$, we have $\mathrm{Ric}_p(P,w) \geq K|w|^2$ (resp. $\mathrm{Ric}_p(P,w) \leq K|w|^2$); in this case we write $\mathrm{Ric}_p \geq K$ (resp. $\mathrm{Ric}_p \leq K$).

Remark 2.3 (Some notable cases). The cases $p = 1, 2$ are strictly linked with the sectional curvature while $p = n-1, n$ are related to the standard Ricci curvature. More precisely

- $p = 1$: if P is the real line spanned by v, $\langle v, w\rangle = 0$, $|v| = |w| = 1$, then
$$\mathrm{Ric}_1(P,w) = \mathrm{Sec}(v,w);$$
on the other hand $\mathrm{Ric}_1(P,v) = 0$, i.e. the 1-Ricci curvature always vanishes in the direction of P itself. In particular no Riemannian manifold has 1-Ricci curvature bounded from below (resp. above) by a strictly positive (resp. negative) constant. Nevertheless M has non-negative (resp. non-positive) 1-Ricci curvature if and only if the sectional curvature is non-negative (resp. non-positive).
- $p = 2$: if P is the 2-plane spanned by the orthonormal vectors e_1, e_2 then
$$\mathrm{Ric}_2(P,e_1) = \mathrm{Ric}_2(P,e_2) = \mathrm{Sec}(e_1,e_2). \tag{3}$$
Moreover, if w is orthogonal to P with $|w| = 1$ then
$$\mathrm{Ric}_2(P,w) = \mathrm{Sec}(e_1,w) + \mathrm{Sec}(e_2,w).$$
In particular for every $K \geq 0$ (resp. $K \leq 0$), it holds $\mathrm{Ric}_2 \geq K$ (resp. $\mathrm{Ric}_2 \leq K$) if and only if $\mathrm{Sec} \geq K$ (resp. $\mathrm{Sec} \leq K$). Note also that if $\mathrm{Sec} \geq K \geq 0$ then for every $p \in \{2,\dots,n\}$ it holds $\mathrm{Ric}_p \geq (p-1)K$.
- $p = n-1$: if P is an $n-1$-plane and w is orthogonal to P, then
$$\mathrm{Ric}_{n-1}(P,w) = \mathrm{Ric}(w,w).$$
- $p = n$: in this case one has $P = T_xM$, and for every $w \in T_xM$ it holds
$$\mathrm{Ric}_n(T_xM,w) = \mathrm{Ric}(w,w).$$
- If $\mathrm{Sec} \geq K$, depending on the sign of $K \in \mathbb{R}$ we have:
  - $\mathrm{Sec} \geq K \geq 0$ implies that $\mathrm{Ric}_p \geq (p-1)K$, for all $p \in \{1,\dots,n\}$
  - $\mathrm{Sec} \geq K$ with $K \leq 0$ implies that $\mathrm{Ric}_n \geq (n-1)K$ and $\mathrm{Ric}_p \geq pK$ for all $p \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}$.

Distortion coefficients. Here we briefly recall the so-called volume distortion coefficients. Given two numbers $K, N \in \mathbb{R}$ with $N \geq 1$, we set for $(t,\theta) \in [0,1]\times\mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\sigma^{(t)}_{K,N}(\theta) := \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } K\theta^2 \geq N\pi^2, \\ \dfrac{\sin(t\theta\sqrt{K/N})}{\sin(\theta\sqrt{K/N})} & \text{if } 0 < K\theta^2 < N\pi^2, \\ t & \text{if } K\theta^2 < 0 \text{ and } N = 0, \text{ or if } K\theta^2 = 0, \\ \dfrac{\sinh(t\theta\sqrt{-K/N})}{\sinh(\theta\sqrt{-K/N})} & \text{if } K\theta^2 \leq 0 \text{ and } N > 0. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

We also set, for $N \geq 1, K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(t,\theta) \in [0,1]\times\mathbb{R}^+$

$$\tau^{(t)}_{K,N}(\theta) := t^{1/N}\sigma^{(t)}_{K,N-1}(\theta)^{(N-1)/N}. \tag{5}$$

3. Some preliminary/motivational results

In this section we present the following preliminary/motivational result containing the main geometric idea but technically less involved since we assume a lot of regularity. In the next section, we will relax the regularity assumptions at the price of becoming slightly more technical.

Theorem 3.1. *Let (M,g) be a complete Riemannian manifold without boundary, and fix $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following statements* (i) *and* (ii) *are equivalent and imply* (ii)′*:*

(i) *M has p-Ricci curvature bounded from below by $K \in \mathbb{R}$.*

(ii) *Let Σ_0 be a p-dimensional smooth submanifold and let $\mu_0 = \rho_0 \mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ for some density ρ_0. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ be a Kantorovich potential and assume that the map $T_t : M \to M$ defined by $T_t(x) := \exp_x(-t\nabla\phi(x))$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image, for each $t \in [0,1]$. Denote by $\mu_t := (T_t)_\sharp \mu_0$, for $t \in [0,1]$. Then $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a W_2-geodesic made of $\mathcal{H}^p$-absolutely continuous probability measures and it holds*

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p) \le -\int_{M^2} \Big[\sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\Big]\, d\pi(x,y), \quad \forall t \in [0,1],\ \forall p' \ge p,$$

where $\pi = (\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma_0}, T_1)_\sharp \mu_0$ and ρ_t is the density of μ_t w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}^p$.

(ii)′ *Moreover, if $p > 1$ and if there exists a smooth p-dimensional submanifold $\bar\Sigma \subset M$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mu_t \subset \bar\Sigma$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, then*

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p) \le -\int_{X^2} \Big[\tau_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \tau_{K,p'}^{(t)}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\Big]\, d\pi(x,y), \quad \forall t \in [0,1],\ \forall p' \ge p.$$

Proof. (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii).
First of all note that $\exp_x(-t\nabla\phi(x)) =: \gamma_x(t)$ is geodesic for every $x \in \Sigma_0$; moreover, since by assumption $T_t : M \to M$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image, $\Sigma_t := T_t(\Sigma_0)$ is a smooth submanifold and $\mu_t := (T_t)_\sharp\mu_0 \ll \mathcal{H}^p$. Choose an orthonormal basis $(e_1,\dots,e_p)$ of $T_x\Sigma_0$ and consider the Jacobi fields $J_1,\dots,J_p : [0,1] \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}M$ such that $J_i(0) = e_i$ and $J_i'(0) = [\nabla^2\phi(x)]e_i$, where we interpret the Hessian $\nabla^2\phi(x) : T_xM \to T_xM$ as self-adjoint linear operator. The Jacobi field equation reads

$$J_i''(t) + R(\dot\gamma_x(t), J_i(t))\dot\gamma_x(t) = 0, \quad \forall i = 1,\dots,p.$$

This is equivalent to say that the linear operator $B_x(t) : T_x\Sigma_0 \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}M$ defined by $B_x(t)e_i = J_i(t)$ solves

$$B_x''(t) + R(\dot\gamma_x(t), B_x(t))\dot\gamma_x(t) = 0, \quad \text{with } B_x(0) = \mathrm{id}_{T_x\Sigma} \text{ and } B_x'(0) = \nabla^2\phi(x)|_{T_x\Sigma_0}.$$

Note that $B_x(t) = D(T_t)_x \llcorner T_x\Sigma_0$, moreover $B_x(t)$ is invertible since by assumption T_t is a local diffeomorphism onto its image.

Now consider $\mathcal{U}_x(t) = B_x'(t)B_x^{-1}(t) : T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t$ and observe that the Jacobi field equation yields

$$\mathcal{U}_x'(t) + \mathcal{U}_x(t)^2 + R(\dot\gamma_x(t), \mathrm{id}_{T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t})\dot\gamma_x(t) = 0, \tag{6}$$

meaning in more standard terms that

$$\mathcal{U}_x'(t)v + \mathcal{U}_x(t)^2 v + R(\dot\gamma_x(t), v)\dot\gamma_x(t) = 0, \quad \forall v \in T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t.$$

Taking the trace of (6) gives the Riccati equation

$$\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x'(t)] + \mathrm{tr}\big[\mathcal{U}_x(t)^2\big] + \mathrm{Ric}_p(T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t, \dot\gamma_x(t)) = 0. \tag{7}$$

Using the assumption that $\mathrm{Ric}_p \ge K$ and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we obtain

$$\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)]' + \frac{1}{p'}\big[\mathrm{tr}\,\mathcal{U}_x(t)\big]^2 + K|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2 \le 0, \quad \forall p' \ge p. \tag{8}$$

On the other hand, if we set $y_x(t) = \log \mathcal{J}_x(t) = \log \det B_x(t)$, we obtain that $y_x'(t) = \mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)]$. Writing the Riccati inequality (8) in terms of y_x gives

$$y_x'' + \frac{1}{p'}(y_x')^2 + K|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2 \le 0, \quad \forall p' \ge p,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(\mathcal{J}^{\frac{1}{p'}})_x'' + \frac{K}{p'}|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2 \mathcal{J}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \le 0, \quad \forall p' \ge p.$$

Classical Sturm comparison results then imply

$$\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(t) \ge \sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\, \mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(0) + \sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\, \mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(1), \quad \forall p' \ge p. \tag{9}$$

In order to complete the proof we will make use of the Monge-Ampère equation

$$\rho_t(T_t(x)) \det[DT_t(x)] = \rho_0(x), \quad \mathcal{H}^p\text{-a.e. } x \in \Sigma_0. \tag{10}$$

Let us briefly derive it. Fix an arbitrary open subset $U \subset \Sigma_0$. By the change of variable formula for the local diffeomorphism T_t from Σ_0 to Σ_t we get

$$\int_U \rho_t(T_t(x)) \det[DT_t(x)]\, d\mathcal{H}^p(x) = \int_{T_t(U)} \rho_t(y)\, d\mathcal{H}^p(y) = \int_U \rho_0(x) d\mathcal{H}^p(x),$$

where in the second equality we used that, by construction, $(T_t)_\sharp \mu_0 = \mu_t = \rho_t \mathcal{H}^p$. Since U is arbitrary, we obtain the Monge-Ampère equation (10).

Using (10) and recalling that we set $\mathcal{J}_x(t) := \det[DT_t(x)]$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Sigma_t} \rho_t(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} d\mu_t(y) = \int_{\Sigma_t} \mathcal{J}_{T_t^{-1}(y)}^{\frac{1}{p'}}(t)\, \rho_0(T_t^{-1}(y))^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\, d\mu_t(y) = \int_{\Sigma_0} \mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(t)\, \rho_0(x)^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}\, d\mathcal{H}^p(x). \tag{11}$$

Combining the last identity with (9) and (10) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Sigma_t} \rho_t^{1-\frac{1}{p'}} d\mathcal{H}^p &\ge \int_{\Sigma_0} \left[\sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\, \mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(0) + \sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\, \mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(1)\right] \rho_0(x)^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}\, d\mathcal{H}^p(x) \\
&= \int_{\Sigma_0} \left[\sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(\mathsf{d}(x, T_1(x)))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(\mathsf{d}(x, T_1(x)))\rho_1(T_1(x))^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\right] \rho_0(x)\, d\mathcal{H}^p(x) \\
&= \int_{\Sigma_0} \left[\sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\, \rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\, \rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\right] d\pi(x,y), \quad \forall p' \ge p,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\pi = (\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma_0}, T_1)_\sharp \mu_0$, giving the claim of (ii).

(i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii)'. If T_t maps $\bar\Sigma$ to itself for every $t \in [0,1]$, in particular we have that $\gamma_x(t) \in \bar\Sigma$ for every $t \in [0,1]$ and $x \in \Sigma_0$. Following verbatim the computations performed in Part (c) of the proof of [17, Theorem 1.7] (see also [4, Lemma 6.1, Corollary 2.2] where such an improvement was first noticed), it is then possible to improve (9) to

$$\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(t) \ge \tau_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\, \mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(0) + \tau_{K,p'}^{(t)}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\, \mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(1), \quad \forall p' \ge p. \tag{12}$$

The claim (ii)' follows then by the same arguments as in the implication (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii).

(ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i).

We argue by contradiction. Assume there exist $x_0 \in M$, a p-dimensional plane $P \subset T_{x_0}M$ and $0 \neq v \in T_{x_0}M$ such that the p-Ricci curvature of P in the direction of v satisfies

$$\mathrm{Ric}_p(P, v) < (K - 3\epsilon)|v|^2, \tag{13}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small such that $\exp_{x_0}|_{B_\delta(0)}$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image. Then $\exp_{x_0}(P \cap B_\delta(0)) =: \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a smooth p-dimensional submanifold. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ be a Kantorovich potential such that

$$\nabla\phi(x_0) = v \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^2\phi(x_0) = 0.$$

By replacing ϕ with $\eta\phi$ for a sufficiently small number $\eta > 0$ we get that $-\phi$ is a Kantorovich potential as well and $|\nabla\phi|(y)$ is smaller than the injectivity radius at y, for every $y \in \mathrm{supp}(\phi) \subset M$. Therefore $T_t(y) = \exp_y(-t\nabla\phi(y))$ is a diffeomorphism from $B_\delta(0)$ onto its image for any $t \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. Hence, $\Sigma_t := T_{t-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}})$ for $t \in [0,1]$ is a 1-parameter family of smooth p-dimensional submanifolds with finite p-dimensional Hausdorff measure. We define $\mu_{\frac{1}{2}} := \mathcal{H}^p(\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}\,\mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}$; note that $\mu_t := (T_{t-\frac{1}{2}})_\sharp \mu_{\frac{1}{2}}$, with $t \in [0,1]$, is the unique L^2-Wasserstein geodesic between μ_0 and μ_1. Moreover, by construction, μ_t is a $\mathcal{H}^p$-absolutely continuous probability measure concentrated on Σ_t.
Calling $\gamma_x(t) := T_{t-\frac{1}{2}}(x) = \exp_x\big(-\big(t-\frac{1}{2}\big)\nabla\phi(x)\big)$ for $x \in \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}$ the geodesic performing the transport, note that by continuity there exist $\delta, \sigma > 0$ small enough such that

$$\mathrm{Ric}_p(T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t, \dot\gamma_x(t)) < (K-2\epsilon)|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}} \subset B_\delta(x_0), \quad \forall t \in \left[\frac{1}{2}-\sigma, \frac{1}{2}+\sigma\right]. \tag{14}$$

Now we first briefly repeat the calculations from the first part of the proof, with the difference that we take Cauchy initial data at $t = \frac{1}{2}$ instead of $t = 0$.
For every $x \in \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}$ note that $\gamma_x(t) := T_{t-\frac{1}{2}}(x)$ is a geodesic connecting $T_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \in \Sigma_0$ to $T_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \in \Sigma_1$. Choose an orthonormal basis $(e_1, \dots, e_p)$ of $T_x\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and consider the Jacobi fields $J_1, \dots, J_p : [0,1] \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}M$ such that $J_i(\frac{1}{2}) = e_i$ and $J_i'(\frac{1}{2}) = [\nabla^2\phi(x)]e_i$. By introducing the linear operator $B_x(t) : T_x\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}} \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}M$ by $B_x(t)e_i = J_i(t)$, the Jacobi field equation reads

$$B_x''(t) + R(\dot\gamma_x(t), B_x(t))\dot\gamma_x(t) = 0, \quad B_x(1/2) = \mathrm{id}_{T_x\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}},\ B_x'(1/2) = \nabla^2\phi(x)|_{T_x\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}}. \tag{15}$$

Since T_t is a local diffeomorphism and $B_x(t) = D(T_t)_x|_{T_x\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}}$, we have that $B_x(t)$ is invertible. Setting $\mathcal{U}_x(t) := B_x'(t)B_x^{-1}(t) : T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t$ for every $x \in \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and repeating the calculations of the first part of the proof, we get the equation

$$\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x'(t)] + \mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)^2] + \mathrm{Ric}_p(T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t, \dot\gamma_x(t)) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall t \in [0,1]. \tag{16}$$

Since by construction $\mathcal{U}_{x_0}(0) := B_{x_0}'(0)B_{x_0}^{-1}(0) = \nabla^2\phi(x_0)|_{T_{x_0}\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}} = 0$ and $v \neq 0$, again by continuity we can choose $\delta, \sigma > 0$ even smaller so that

$$\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)^2] < \epsilon|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}} \subset B_\delta(x_0), \quad \forall t \in \left[\frac{1}{2}-\sigma, \frac{1}{2}+\sigma\right]. \tag{17}$$

The combination of (14), (16) and (17) then yields

$$0 < \mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x'(t)] + (K-\epsilon)|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2 \leq \mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x'(t)] + \frac{1}{p}\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)]^2 + (K-\epsilon)\,|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2,\ \forall x \in \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}},\ \forall t \in \left[\frac{1}{2}-\sigma, \frac{1}{2}+\sigma\right].$$

Observe that the affine reparametrization $t = g(s) = \frac{1}{2} - \sigma + 2\sigma s$, $g : [0,1] \to \left[\frac{1}{2}-\sigma, \frac{1}{2}+\sigma\right]$, corresponds to consider the rescaled Kantorovich potential $2\sigma\phi$ in place of ϕ in the arguments above, and thus gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x'(g(s))] + \frac{1}{p}\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(g(s))]^2 + (K-\epsilon)\,|\dot\gamma_x(g(s))|^2 &= 4\sigma^2\left[\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x'(t)] + \frac{1}{p}\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)]^2 + (K-\epsilon)\,|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2\right] \\ &> 0, \qquad \forall x \in \Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}},\ \forall s \in [0,1].\end{aligned}$$

Since g is affine, the restricted and rescaled curve $\{\tilde\mu_s := \mu_{g(s)}\}_{s\in[0,1]}$ is still a W_2-geodesic from $\tilde\mu_0 = \mu_{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma}$ to $\tilde\mu_1 = \mu_{\frac{1}{2}+\sigma}$. By repeating the arguments after (8) in the proof of (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii), with reversed inequalities and K replaced by $K-\epsilon$, we obtain

$$\int_{M^2}\left[\sigma^{(\frac{1}{2})}_{K-\epsilon,p}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\tilde\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p}} + \sigma^{(\frac{1}{2})}_{K-\epsilon,p}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\tilde\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p}}\right]d\tilde\pi(x,y) > \int_{\Sigma_{\frac{1}{2}}}\tilde\rho_{\frac{1}{2}}(y)^{-\frac{1}{p}}d\tilde\mu_{\frac{1}{2}}(y), \tag{18}$$

where $\tilde\pi$ is the optimal plan induced by the W_2-geodesic $\{\tilde\mu_s = \tilde\rho_s \mathcal{H}^p\}_{s\in[0,1]}$, i.e. $\tilde\pi := (T_{-\sigma}, T_\sigma)_\sharp \mu_{1/2}$. Using that the distortion coefficients $\sigma^{(t)}_{K,p}(\theta)$ are monotone increasing in K, we arrive to contradict (ii) with $t = \frac{1}{2}$. □

In the case of Ric_1, the arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.1 also provide a characterization of upper curvature bounds. Indeed the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality after formula (7) is actually an identity for $p' = p = 1$. Therefore, in case of an upper curvature bound $\mathrm{Ric}_1 \le K$, we can estimate (7) from above. Recall also from Remark 2.3 that the condition $\mathrm{Ric}_1 \le K < 0$ is never satisfied as $\mathrm{Ric}_1(\mathbb{R}v, v) = 0$ for every $v \in TM$; hence it makes sense just to assume a non-negative upper bound $K \ge 0$ and, in this case, $\mathrm{Ric}_1 \le K$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{Sec} \le K$. Following the same arguments as above one can then show the following result.

Proposition 3.2 (Upper curvature bounds)**.** *Let (M, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold with $\partial M = \emptyset$ and let $K \ge 0$. Then the following statements* (i) *and* (ii) *are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathrm{Ric}_1 \le K$ *or, equivalently,* $\mathrm{Sec} \le K$.

(ii) *Let Σ_0 be a 1-dimensional, smooth submanifold, and let $\mu_0 = \rho_0 \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(M, \mathcal{H}^1)$, for some density ρ_0. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ be a Kantorovich potential and assume that the map $T_t : M \to M$ defined by $T_t(x) := \exp_x(-t\nabla\phi(x))$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image, for each $t \in [0,1]$.*
Denote by $\mu_t := (T_t)_\sharp \mu_0$, for $t \in [0,1]$. Then $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a W_2- geodesic made of $\mathcal{H}^1$-absolutely continuous probability measures and it holds

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^1) = -\mathcal{H}^1(\operatorname{supp}\mu_t) &\ge -\int_{M^2} \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,1}(\mathsf{d}(x, T_1(x))) + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,1}(\mathsf{d}(x, T_1(x)))\right] d\mathcal{H}^1(x) \\ &= -\int_{M^2} \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,1}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-1} + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,1}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-1}\right] d\pi(x,y), \quad \forall t \in [0,1], \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi = (\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma_0}, T_1)_\sharp \mu_0$ and ρ_t is the density of μ_t w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}^1$.

Notice that in the next section there will not be such characterization in terms of the more general theorems since the entropy in general drops down at endpoints of geodesics.

As observed in Remark 2.3, a non-negative lower bound on the sectional curvature $\mathrm{Sec} \ge K \ge 0$ is equivalent to the same lower bound $\mathrm{Ric}_2 \ge K \ge 0$, and implies that for every $p \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ it holds $\mathrm{Ric}_p \ge (p-1)K$. Also, if $K \le 0$ then $\mathrm{Sec} \ge K$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{Ric}_1 \ge K$ and implies $\mathrm{Ric}_p \ge \min\{p, n-1\}K$. Therefore the next corollary follows directly from Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.3. *Let (M, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold with $\partial M = \emptyset$ and fix $K \in \mathbb{R}$.*

- *If $K \ge 0$ then the following statements* (i) *and* (ii) *are equivalent:*

  (i) *M has sectional curvature bounded from below by K, i.e.* $\mathrm{Sec} \ge K$.

  (ii) *Fix any $p \in \{2, \dots, n\}$. Let Σ_0 be a p-dimensional smooth submanifold, and let $\mu_0 = \rho_0 \mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ for some density ρ_0. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ be a Kantorovich potential and assume that the map $T_t : M \to M$ defined by $T_t(x) := \exp_x(-t\nabla\phi(x))$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image, for each $t \in [0,1]$.*
  Denote by $\mu_t := (T_t)_\sharp \mu_0$, for $t \in [0,1]$. Then $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a W_2-geodesic made of $\mathcal{H}^p$-absolutely continuous probability measures and, for all $t \in [0,1]$ and all $p' \ge p$, it holds

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p) \le -\int_{M^2} \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{(p-1)K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{(p-1)K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\right] d\pi(x,y),$$

  where $\pi = (\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma_0}, T_1)_\sharp \mu_0$ and ρ_t is the density of μ_t w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}^p$.
- *If $K \le 0$ then the following statements* (i) *and* (ii) *are equivalent:*
  (i) *M has sectional curvature bounded from below by K, i.e.* $\mathrm{Sec} \ge K$.

(ii) *Fix any* $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. *Let* Σ_0 *be a* p*-dimensional smooth submanifold, and let* $\mu_0 = \rho_0 \mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ *for some density* ρ_0. *Let* $\phi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ *be a Kantorovich potential and assume that the map* $T_t : M \to M$ *defined by* $T_t(x) := \exp_x(-t\nabla\phi(x))$ *is a diffeomorphism onto its image, for each* $t \in [0,1]$.
Denote by $\mu_t := (T_t)_\sharp \mu_0$, *for* $t \in [0,1]$. *Then* $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ *is a* W_2*-geodesic made of* $\mathcal{H}^p$*-absolutely continuous probability measures and, for all* $t \in [0,1]$ *and all* $p' \geq p$, *it holds*

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p) \leq -\int_{M^2} \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{\bar K, p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{\bar K, p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\right] d\pi(x,y),$$

where $\bar K := \min\{p, n-1\}K$, $\pi = (\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma_0}, T_1)_\sharp \mu_0$ *and* ρ_t *is the density of* μ_t *w.r.t.* $\mathcal{H}^p$.

With analogous arguments we can prove the following slightly different characterization of lower (and upper) sectional curvature bounds for an arbitrary bound $K \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let* (M, g) *be a complete Riemannian manifold with* $\partial M = \emptyset$. *Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) M *has sectional curvature bounded from below by* $K \in \mathbb{R}$ *(resp. from above by* $K \in \mathbb{R}$*).*

(ii) *Let* Σ_0 *be a* 1*-dimensional, smooth submanifold and let* $\mu_0 := \rho_0 \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(M, \mathcal{H}^1)$ *for some density* ρ_0.
Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(M)$ *be a Kantorovich potential with* $\nabla\phi(x) \notin T_x\Sigma_0$ *for every* $x \in \Sigma_0$. *Called* $T_t : M \to M$, $T_t(x) := \exp_x(-t\nabla\phi(x))$, *assume that* T_t *is a diffeomorphism for each* $t \in [0,1]$ *and that for every* $x \in \Sigma_0$ *there are no conjugate times along the geodesic* $t \mapsto \gamma_x(t) := \exp_x(-t\nabla\phi(x))$ *for* $t \in [0,1]$.

Then the L^2*-Wasserstein geodesic* $\mu_t = (T_t)_\sharp \mu_0$ *is a 1-parameter family of* $\mathcal{H}^1$*-absolutely continuous probability measures satisfying*

$$S_p(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^1) \leq -\int_{M^2} \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,p}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p}}\right] d\pi(x,y), \quad \forall p \geq 1,\ \forall t \in [0,1],$$

where $\pi = (\mathrm{id}_{\Sigma_0}, T_1)_\sharp \mu_0$ *and* ρ_t *is the density of* μ_t *w.r.t.* $\mathcal{H}^1$*; respectively, if* $\mathrm{Sec} \leq K$ *then*

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^1) = -\mathcal{H}^1(\operatorname{supp}\mu_t) &\geq -\int_{M^2} \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,1}(\mathsf{d}(x, T_1(x))) + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,1}(\mathsf{d}(x, T_1(x)))\right] d\mathcal{H}^1(x) \\ &= -\int_{M^2} \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,1}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-1} + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,1}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-1}\right] d\pi(x,y), \quad \forall t \in [0,1]. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.5. The assumption in (ii) that there are no conjugate times along the geodesic $t \mapsto \gamma_x(t) := \exp_x(-t\nabla\phi(x))$ for $t \in [0,1]$ can be always achieved up to rescaling the Kantorovich potential ϕ by a suitably small strictly positive constant.

Proof. (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii).

Let v, with $|v| = 1$, be a vector field along Σ_0 such that $T_x\Sigma_0 = \mathbb{R}v(x)$ and consider the Jacobi field $J : [0,1] \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}M$ such that $J(0) = v$ and $J'(0) = [\nabla^2\phi(x)]v$. Note that, since by assumption the geodesic $\gamma_x(\cdot)$ has no conjugate times on $[0,1]$ and $\dot\gamma_x(0) = \nabla\phi(x)$ is not collinear with v, the Jacobi field $J(t)$ will stay linearly independent with $\dot\gamma_x(t)$ for every $t \in [0,1]$.
Denote $\Sigma_t := T_t(\Sigma_0)$ and consider the real valued function $B_x(t) : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ defined by $B_x(t)v = J(t)$. Calling $\mathcal{U}_x(t) = \frac{B_x'(t)}{B_x(t)} \in \mathbb{R}$, the Jacobi equation gives

$$\mathcal{U}_x'(t) + \mathcal{U}_x(t)^2 + \mathrm{Sec}(\dot\gamma_x(t), J(t))\,|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2 = 0.$$

The rest of the proof follows verbatim the arguments of (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii) in Theorem 3.1, noting that for the case $\mathrm{Sec} \leq K$ we can just reverse all the inequalities since for $p = 1$ there is no need to use Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to get a scalar quantity as $\mathcal{U}_x(t)^2$ is already a scalar.

The proof of (ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i) is analogous to the proof of (ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i) in Theorem 3.1. □

4. Statement and proof of the main results

The goal of the present section is to prove the next result, relaxing the regularity assumptions of the previous section.

Theorem 4.1. *Let (M,g) be a complete n-dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary and fix $K\in\mathbb{R}$, $p\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Then the statements* (i), (ii) *are equivalent and imply* (ii)$'$*:*

(i) *M has p-Ricci curvature bounded from below by K, i.e.* $\mathrm{Ric}_p\geq K$.

(ii) *Let $\mu_0,\mu_1\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ with $\mu_i=\rho_i\,\mathcal{H}^p$. Assume there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ between μ_0 and μ_1 such that for some $t_0\in(0,1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0}\subset M$. Then $\mu_t=\rho_t\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ for a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_t\subset M$ for every $t\in[0,1]$ and it holds*

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p)\leq-\int\Big[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}+\sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\Big]\,d\pi(x,y),\quad\forall t\in[0,1],$$

for all $p'\geq p$, where π is the optimal coupling induced by the W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$.

(ii)$'$ *if $p>1$ and there exists a smooth p-dimensional submanifold $\bar\Sigma$ such that* $\operatorname{supp}\mu_t\subset\bar\Sigma$ *for all $t\in[0,1]$, then the following stronger convexity inequality holds*

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p)\leq-\int\Big[\tau^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,T(x)))\rho_0(x)^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}+\tau^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,T(x)))\rho_1(y)^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}\Big]\,d\mathcal{H}^p(x),$$

for all $t\in[0,1]$ and all $p'\geq p$.

By analogous arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, one can also encode lower bounds on the p-Ricci curvature in terms of convexity of the relative Shannon entropy:

Theorem 4.2. *Let (M,g) be a complete n-dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary and fix $K\in\mathbb{R}$, $p\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Then the following statements* (i) *and* (ii) *are equivalent:*

(i) *M has p-Ricci curvature bounded from below by K, i.e.* $\mathrm{Ric}_p\geq K$.

(ii) *Let $\mu_0,\mu_1\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$. Assume there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ between μ_0 and μ_1 such that for some $t_0\in(0,1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0}\subset M$. Then $\mu_t=\rho_t\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ for every $t\in[0,1]$ for a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_t\subset M$ and*

$$\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p)\leq(1-t)\,\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_0|\mathcal{H}^p)+t\,\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_1|\mathcal{H}^p)-\frac{K}{2}t(1-t)W_2^2(\mu_0,\mu_1),\quad\forall t\in[0,1],$$

in other words the real function $t\mapsto\mathrm{Ent}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p)$ is K-convex.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As observed in Remark 2.3,

- if $K\geq0$ then $\mathrm{Ric}_2\geq K$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{Sec}\geq K$, and implies $\mathrm{Ric}_p\geq(p-1)K$ for every $p\in\{2,\dots,n\}$,
- if $K\leq0$ then $\mathrm{Ric}_1\geq K$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{Sec}\geq K$, and implies $\mathrm{Ric}_p\geq\min\{p,n-1\}K$ for every $p\in\{1,\dots,n\}$.

Theorem 1.1 is then a direct consequence of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. □

In order to prove Theorem 4.1 in the end of the section, we will need several auxiliary results of independent interest. A first useful technical result is the following consequence of the Monge-Mather shortening principle [19, Theorem 8.5].

Theorem 4.3. *Consider a Riemannian manifold (M,g), fix a compact subset $E\subset\subset M$ and let Π be a dynamical optimal plan such that $(\mathrm{e}_t)_\sharp\Pi$ is supported in E for every $t\in[0,1]$.*

Then Π *is supported on a set of geodesics* $S \subset \mathrm{Geo}(M)$ *satisfying the following: for every* $t_0 \in (0,1)$ *there exists* $C_E(t_0) > 0$ *such that for any two geodesics* $\gamma, \eta \in S$ *it holds*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathsf{d}(\gamma(t),\eta(t)) \le C_E(t_0)\, \mathsf{d}(\gamma(t_0),\eta(t_0)),$$

where d *is the Riemannian distance on* (M,g).

Remark 4.4. As a consequence of Theorem 4.3, if $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a W_2-geodesic with μ_0, μ_1 compactly supported probability measures on M, and $t_0 \in (0,1)$ is given, then for any $t \in [0,1]$ the map $T^t_{t_0}$: $\gamma(t_0) \mapsto \gamma(t)$ is well-defined μ_{t_0}-almost everywhere and Lipschitz continuous on its domain; moreover it is the unique optimal transport map between μ_{t_0} and μ_t. In other words, the optimal coupling $(\mathrm{e}_{t_0}, \mathrm{e}_t)_\sharp \Pi$ is induced by $T^t_{t_0}$, i.e. $(\mathrm{e}_{t_0}, \mathrm{e}_t)_\sharp \Pi = (\mathrm{id}, T^t_{t_0})_\sharp \mu_{t_0}$.

An important preliminary step in the proof of Theorem 4.1 is to show that $\mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ is a geodesically convex subset of $\mathcal{P}_2(M)$. This is the content of the next lemma which at the best of our knowledge is original and of independent interest.

Lemma 4.5. *Let* (M,g) *be a complete* n*-dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary, and let* $p \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. *Then* $\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ *is a geodesically convex subset of* $\mathcal{P}_2(M)$, *more precisely:*

1. *for every* $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ *there exists a* W_2*-geodesic* $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ *such that* $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ *for every* $t \in [0,1]$*;*
2. *for every* $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ *if* $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(M)$ *is a* W_2*-geodesic, then* $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ *for every* $t \in [0,1]$.

Proof. First of all since a complete Riemannian manifold is a geodesic metric space (i.e. any two points are joined by a length minimizing geodesic), it is well known that also the L^2-Wasserstein metric space $(\mathcal{P}_c(M), W_2)$ is geodesic. Therefore if we prove (2) then also (1) will follow.

Step 1. Consider $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ and write $\mu_i = \rho_i \mathcal{H}^p$ for $i = 0, 1$. Let $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{Geo}(M))$ a dynamical optimal plan between μ_0 and μ_1, and let $\{\mu_t := (e_t)_\sharp \Pi\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ be the induced L^2-Wasserstein geodesic. We denote with $\pi_{s,t} = (\mathrm{e}_s, \mathrm{e}_t)_\sharp \Pi$ the corresponding optimal coupling between μ_s and μ_t for any $s, t \in [0,1]$. Since μ_0 and μ_1 have compact support, then there exists a compact subset $E \subset\subset M$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mu_t \subset E$ for every $t \in [0,1]$.

By Theorem 4.3, the dynamical optimal plan Π is supported on set $S \subset \mathrm{Geo}(M)$ satisfying the following: for any $s \in (0,1)$ there exists $C_E(s) > 0$ such that for any $t \in [0,1]$ it holds

$$\mathsf{d}(\gamma(t),\eta(t)) \le C_E(s)\, \mathsf{d}(\gamma(s),\eta(s)) \quad \text{for any pair } \gamma, \eta \in S. \tag{19}$$

As observed in Remark 4.4, the optimal plan $\pi_{s,t}$ is then induced by a Lipschitz-continuous optimal transport map $T^t_s : \operatorname{supp}\mu_s \to \operatorname{supp}\mu_t$ with Lipschitz constant bounded above by $C_E(s)$. In particular $(T^t_s)_\sharp \mu_s = \mu_t$.

Step 2. Let $s \in (0,1)$, and consider $\pi_{s,0} := (\mathrm{e}_s, \mathrm{e}_0)_\sharp \Pi$. We show that μ_s is absolutely continuous w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}^p$. Our goal is then to show that if $A \subset \operatorname{supp}\mu_s$ satisfyies $\mathcal{H}^p(A) = 0$, then $\mu_s(A) = 0$ as well. Since by step 1 the plan $\pi_{s,0}$ is induced by the map T^0_s, we have

$$\mu_s(A) = \pi_{s,0}(A, M) = \pi_{s,0}(A, T^0_s(A)). \tag{20}$$

On the other hand

$$\pi_{s,0}(A, T^0_s(A)) \le \pi_{s,0}(M, T^0_s(A)) = \mu_0(T^0_s(A)). \tag{21}$$

Since $T^0_s : \operatorname{supp}\mu_s \to \operatorname{supp}\mu_0$ is Lipschitz and $\mathcal{H}^p(A) = 0$, then it also holds $\mathcal{H}^p(T^0_s(A)) = 0$. Recalling that by assumption $\mu_0 \ll \mathcal{H}^p$, we then get that $\mu_0(T^0_s(A)) = 0$. The claim follows then by the combination of (21) and (20). □

Remark 4.6. In the proof of Lemma 4.5 we actually proved the stronger statement that if $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ and $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$ then any W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ from μ_0 to μ_1 satisfies that $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ for any $t \in (0,1)$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let (M,g) be a complete n-dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary, and let $p\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Let $\mu_0,\mu_1\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ and assume $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a W_2-geodesic between μ_0 and μ_1 such that for some $t_0\in(0,1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0}\subset M$.*

Then for every $t\in[0,1]$ there exists a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_t\subset M$ such that μ_t is concentrated on Σ_t; more precisely $\mu_t=\rho_t\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ for a suitable probability density $\rho_t\in L^1(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.3 and Remark 4.4 we know that for every $t\in[0,1]$ there exists a Lipschitz map $T^t_{t_0}:\operatorname{supp}\mu_{t_0}\to\operatorname{supp}\mu_t$ such that $\mu_t=(T^t_{t_0})_\sharp\mu_{t_0}$. Since by assumption μ_{t_0} is concentrated on the countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set Σ_{t_0}, it is then clear that μ_t is concentrated on $\Sigma_t:=T^t_{t_0}(\Sigma_{t_0})$ which is countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set too, as Lipschitz image of a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set. Since from Lemma 4.5 we know that $\mu_t\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$, it follows that $\mu_t\ll\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$. □

Remark 4.8. Recall that by Lemma 4.7 the measure μ_s is concentrated on the p-rectifiable set $\Sigma_s\subset M$; this is still true if we replace Σ_s by $\Sigma_s\cap\operatorname{supp}\mu_s$, so from now on we will always tacitly assume that. Also, since for $s\in(0,1)$ and $t\in[0,1]$ the optimal transport map T^t_s given in Remark 4.4 is well defined μ_s-a.e., from now on we will just consider the restriction $T^t_s\llcorner\Sigma_s$ and, for simplicity of notation, write T^t_s to indicate the map $T^t_s\llcorner\Sigma_s:\Sigma_s\to T^t_s(\Sigma_s)$. Note that, with this notation, for μ_s-a.e. x, the differential $DT^t_s(x)$ is a linear map from the p-dimensional space $T_x\Sigma_s$ to the q-dimensional space $T_{T^t_s(x)}(T^t_s(\Sigma_s))$, $q\le p$ (q possibly depending on x). Once a (resp. orthonormal) basis of T_xM is given, by parallel translation in M along the geodesic $t\mapsto T^t_s(x)$, also a (resp. orthonormal) basis of $T_{T^t_s(x)}M$ is fixed. We can then see $DT^t_s(x)$ as a linear map from $\mathbb{R}^p$ to $\mathbb{R}^p$ (if $q<p$ just identify $\mathbb{R}^q$ with $\{(x^1,\dots,x^p):x^1=\dots=x^{p-q}=0\}$). Since the rank and the determinant are independent of the chosen basis, $\det[DT^t_s(x)]$ and the fact that $DT^t_s(x)$ is non-degenerate are then well defined concepts.

In the next lemma we show that the optimal transport map T^t_s is differentiable μ_s-a.e. on Σ_s and that at least an inequality holds in the Monge-Ampère equation; this will be sufficient (and crucial) to our aim of proving Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.9. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold and $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ a W_2-geodesic with $\mu_t\ll\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t\in\mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ for some countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable subset $\Sigma_t\subset M$, for every $t\in[0,1]$. For fixed $s\in(0,1)$ and $t\in[0,1]$, let T^t_s be the optimal transport map from μ_s to μ_t given in Remark 4.4.*

Then $T^t_s:\Sigma_s\to T^t_s(\Sigma_s)\subset M$ is differentiable μ_s-a.e. and the Monge-Ampère inequality

$$\rho_s(x)\le\det[DT^t_s(x)]\;\rho_t(T^t_s(x))\quad\mu_s\text{-a.e. } x \tag{22}$$

holds with equality if $t,s\in(0,1)$. In particular, $DT^t_s:\mathbb{R}^p\to\mathbb{R}^p$ is μ_s-a.e. non-degenerate.

Let us stress that in the above lemma we do not claim that T^t_s is μ_s-a.e. differentiable as a map from M to M, but just as a map from Σ_s to its image, i.e. we claim differentiability with respect to infinitesimal variations which are tangential to Σ_s.

Proof. **Step 1.** Differentiabiliy μ_s-a.e..
From Theorem 4.3 and Remark 4.4, we know that $T^t_s:\Sigma_s\to T^t_s(\Sigma_s)$ is a Lipschitz map; since by assumption Σ_s is countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable, Rademacher Theorem implies that $T^t_s:\Sigma_s\to T^t_s(\Sigma_s)$ is differentiable $\mathcal{H}^p$-a.e. .

Step 2. Monge-Ampère inequality.
Since by construction $(T^t_s)_\sharp\mu_s=\mu_t$, it follows that for an arbitrary Borel subset $A\subset\Sigma_s$ it holds

$$\mu_s(A)\le\mu_s\left((T^t_s)^{-1}(T^t_s(A))\right)=\mu_t\left(T^t_s(A)\right). \tag{23}$$

Equality holds for $s,t\in(0,1)$ as the map T^t_s is μ_s-essentially injective. Recalling that $\mu_s=\rho_s\,\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_s$ and $\mu_t=\rho_t\,\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t$, by the area formula we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_t\left(T^t_s(A)\right)&=\int_{T^t_s(A)}\rho_t\,d\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t\\ &\le\int_{T^t_s(A)}\rho_t(y)\mathcal{H}^0((T^t_s\llcorner A)^{-1}(y))\,d\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_t(y)=\int_A\rho_t(T^t_s(x))\det\left[DT^t_s(x)\right]\,d\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner\Sigma_s(x),\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

with equality if $s,t \in (0,1)$ as the map T_s^t is μ_s-essentially injective. The combination of (23) and (24) gives that for an arbitrary Borel subset $A \subset \Sigma_s$ it holds

$$\int_A \rho_s \, d\mathcal{H}^p = \mu_s(A) \leq \mu_t(T_s^t(A)) \leq \int_A \rho_t(T_s^t) \det\left[DT_s^t\right] \, d\mathcal{H}^p,$$

and the Monge-Ampère inequality (22) follows, with equality for $s,t \in (0,1)$. □

For the rest of the section we fix $s = 1/2$ and consider the Lipschitz map $T_{1/2}^t : \Sigma_{1/2} \to \Sigma_t$, $t \in [0,1]$. For $\mu_{1/2}$-a.e. $x \in M$ let $\gamma_x \in \mathrm{Geo}(M)$ be the geodesic defined by $t \mapsto \gamma_x(t) := T_{1/2}^t(x)$ and, for $\mu_{1/2}$-a.e. $x \in \Sigma_{1/2}$ let $v(x) \in T_xM$ be such that $\gamma_x(t) = \exp_x(t\, v(x))$.

Lemma 4.10. *The map $M \ni x \mapsto v(x) \in TM$ is well defined and differentiable $\mu_{1/2}$-a.e.. As a consequence we can find a subset $N \subset \Sigma_{1/2}$ (independent of $t \in [0,1]$) with $\mu_{1/2}(N) = 0$, such that for every $t \in [0,1]$ the map $T_{1/2}^t : \Sigma_{1/2} \to \Sigma_t$ is differentiable at every $x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N$.*

Proof. **Step 1**: the map $v(\cdot) : \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N \to TM$ is well defined.
In a first instance let $N \subset \Sigma_{1/2}$, with $\mu_{1/2}(N) = 0$, be such that for every $x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N$ the curve $t \mapsto \gamma_x(t) := T_{1/2}^t(x)$ is a well defined geodesic. In particular, the curve $t \mapsto \gamma_x(t)$ is C^1 and we can set $v(x) = \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=1/2}\gamma_x(t)$; this is clearly well defined as a map from $\Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N$ to TM. Note moreover that, since by standing assumption μ_0 and μ_1 (and therefore all the measures μ_t) have compact support, we have

$$\mu_{1/2}\text{-}\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \Sigma_{1/2}} |v(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{(x,y) \in \operatorname{supp}\mu_0 \times \operatorname{supp}\mu_1} \mathsf{d}(x,y) = C_{\mu_0,\mu_1} < \infty. \tag{25}$$

Step 2: the map $v(\cdot) : \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N \to TM$ is differentiable.
First of all, note that there exists $\delta > 0$ small enough so that $T_xM \supset B_{C_{\mu_0,\mu_1}}(0) \ni w \mapsto \exp_x(tw)$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image for every $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$ and every $x \in \Sigma_{1/2}$. Fix $x_0 \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N$. Since by Lemma 4.9 the map $T_{1/2}^{(1+\delta)/2}$ is differentiable $\mu_{1/2}$-a.e., it follows that also the map

$$B_{\delta C_{\mu_0,\mu_1}}(x_0) \cap \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N \to TM, \qquad x \mapsto v(x) := \frac{2}{\delta} \exp_x^{-1}\left(T_{1/2}^{(1+\delta)/2}(x)\right)$$

is differentiable $\mu_{1/2}$-a.e.. Therefore, up to redefining the $\mu_{1/2}$-negligible set N, the claim is proved. Notice that in particular the map

$$T_{1/2}^t(x) = \exp_x(tv(x)) \quad \text{is differentiable everywhere on } \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N \text{ for every } t \in \Big(\frac{1-\delta}{2}, \frac{1+\delta}{2}\Big). \tag{26}$$

Step 3: the map $T_{1/2}^t : \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N \to \Sigma_t$ is differentiable for every $t \in [0,1]$.
By construction we have that $T_{1/2}^t(x) = \exp_x(tv(x))$ and, using again that μ_0 and μ_1 have compact support, we know that there exists a compact subset $E \subset\subset M$ such that $T_{1/2}^t(\Sigma_{1/2}) \subset E$ for every $t \in [0,1]$. In particular, there exists $\delta > 0$ small enough such that, for every $x_0 \in E$, the exponential map

$$\exp_{(\cdot)}(\cdot) : B_{\delta C_{\mu_0,\mu_1}}(x_0) \times B_{\delta C_{\mu_0,\mu_1}}(0) \to M$$

is smooth, where C_{μ_0,μ_1} was defined in (25).
Let $t_j := \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} j$, for $j = -\lfloor \frac{1}{\delta} \rfloor, \dots, 0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{1}{\delta} \rfloor$, be a $\frac{\delta}{2}$-grid in $[0,1]$ centered at $1/2$; for convenience choose $\delta \notin \mathbb{Q}$ so that $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2}\lfloor \frac{1}{\delta} \rfloor < 1$. By repeating the same argument of step 2 and replacing $1/2$ by t_j in (26), we get that for every $j = -\lfloor \frac{1}{\delta} \rfloor, \dots, 0, \dots, \lfloor \frac{1}{\delta} \rfloor$ there exists a subset $N_j \subset \Sigma_{t_j}$ with $\mu_{t_j}(N_j) = 0$ such that $T_{t_j}^t$ is differentiable everywhere on $\Sigma_{t_j} \setminus N_j$ for every $t \in (t_{j-1}, t_{j+1})$.
Since by Lemma 4.9 the maps $T_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} : \operatorname{supp}\mu_{t_i} \to \operatorname{supp}\mu_{t_{i+1}}$ are bi-Lipschitz and since μ_t is equivalent to $\mathcal{H}^p \llcorner (\Sigma_t \cap \{\rho_t > 0\})$ for every $t \in [0,1]$, we get that

$$N_+ := N_0 \cup \left[(T_{1/2}^{t_1})^{-1}(N_1)\right] \cup \left[(T_{t_1}^{t_2} \circ T_{1/2}^{t_1})^{-1}(N_2)\right] \cup \ldots \cup \left[(T_{\lfloor \frac{1}{\delta} \rfloor}^{t} \circ \ldots \circ T_{t_1}^{t_2} \circ T_{1/2}^{t_1})^{-1}(N_{\lfloor \frac{1}{\delta} \rfloor})\right]$$

satisfies $\mu_{1/2}(N_+) = 0$. Defining analogously N_- by considering $t_j \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and setting $N = N_+ \cup N_-$ we get that $\mu_{1/2}(N) = 0$.

Fix now an arbitrary $t \in [1/2, 1]$ and let $j_0 := \max\{j \,:\, t_j \le t\}$. Since we can write $T^t_{1/2} = T^t_{t_{j_0}} \circ \ldots \circ T^{t_2}_{t_1} \circ T^{t_1}_{1/2}$, it follows that $T^t_{1/2} : \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N \to \Sigma_t$ is differentiable everywhere, as composition of differentiable functions. The argument for $t \in [-1, 1/2]$ is completely analogous, so the lemma is proved. □

Let $N \subset \Sigma_{1/2}$ with $\mu_{1/2}(N) = 0$ be given by Lemma 4.10; since a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set has p-dimensional euclidean tangent $\mathcal{H}^p$-a.e., without loss of generality we can assume that for every $x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N$ it holds $T_x\Sigma_{1/2} = \mathbb{R}^p$. We then set

$$B_x(t) : T_x\Sigma_{1/2} \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}M, \quad B_x(t) := DT^t_{1/2}(x), \quad \forall t \in [0,1],\ \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N. \tag{27}$$

As already explained in Remark 4.8 we can (and we will) see $B_x(t)$ as a map from $\mathbb{R}^p$ to $\mathbb{R}^p$. In the next lemma we establish a key differential inequality satisfied by $t \mapsto \det[B_x(t)]$.

Lemma 4.11. *Let M be a complete Riemannian n-dimensional manifold satisfying $\mathrm{Ric}_p \ge K$, for some $p \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider a W_2-geodesic with $\mu_t \ll \mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \Sigma_t \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ for some countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable subset $\Sigma_t \subset M$, for every $t \in [0,1]$. Let $T^t_{1/2}$ be the optimal transport map from $\mu_{1/2}$ to μ_t, $t \in [0,1]$, and let $B_x(t)$ be defined in (27). Then, calling $\mathcal{J}_x(t) := \det[B_x(t)]$, it holds*

$$\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(t) \ge \sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(0) + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(1),\ \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N,\ \mu_{1/2}(N) = 0,\ \forall p' \ge p,\ \forall t \in [0,1]. \tag{28}$$

Proof. Let $N \subset \Sigma_{1/2}$ with $\mu_{1/2}(N) = 0$ be given as in (27). First of all notice that for $x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N$ the map $t \mapsto B_x(t)$ is smooth since the dependence in the variable t corresponds to the geodesic flow, which is of course is smooth on a Riemannian manifold. By construction, every $x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N$ has a p-dimensional euclidean tangent space $T_x\Sigma_{1/2} = \mathbb{R}^p$. Choose an orthonormal basis $(e_1, \ldots, e_p)$ of $T_x\Sigma_{1/2}$ and consider the vector fields $J_1, \ldots, J_p : [0,1] \to T_{\gamma_x(t)}M$ along the geodesic γ_x defined by

$$J_i(t) := B_x(t)[e_i] := \left(DT^t_{1/2}(x)\right)[e_i] = \left(D(\exp_{(\cdot)}(tv(\cdot)))(x)\right)[e_i], \quad \forall i = 1 \ldots, p, \quad \forall t \in [0,1],$$

where $v(x)$ was defined before Lemma 4.10. A standard computation of Riemannian geometry shows that the map $t \mapsto J_i(t)$ satisfies the Jacobi equation

$$J_i''(t) + R(\dot\gamma_x(t), J_i(t))\dot\gamma_x(t) = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, p, \quad \forall t \in [0,1],$$

which can be then read in terms of $B_x(t)$ as

$$B_x''(t) + R(\dot\gamma_x(t), B_x(t))\dot\gamma_x(t) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N, \quad \forall t \in [0,1]. \tag{29}$$

Since by Lemma 4.9 the linear map $DT_t^{1/2}$ is $\mu_{1/2}$-a.e. non degenerate, up to redefining N we can assume that $B_x(t)$ is invertible for every $x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N$. We can then consider $\mathcal{U}_x(t) := B_x'(t)B_x^{-1}(t)$. The Jacobi field equation (29) yields

$$\mathcal{U}_x'(t) + \mathcal{U}_x(t)^2 + R(\dot\gamma_x(t), \mathrm{id}_{T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t})\dot\gamma_x(t) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N, \quad \forall t \in [0,1],$$

and, by taking the trace, we get

$$\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x'(t)] + \mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)^2] + \mathrm{Ric}_p(T_{\gamma_x(t)}\Sigma_t, \dot\gamma_x(t)) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N, \quad \forall t \in [0,1].$$

Using the assumption $\mathrm{Ric}_p \ge K$ and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we obtain the Riccati inequality

$$\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)]' + \frac{1}{p'}\left(\mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)]\right)^2 + K|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2 \le 0, \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N, \quad \forall t \in [0,1], \quad \forall p' \ge p. \tag{30}$$

On the other hand, if we set $y_x(t) = \log \mathcal{J}_x(t) = \log \det B_x(t)$, we obtain that $y_x'(t) = \mathrm{tr}[\mathcal{U}_x(t)]$. Writing the Riccati inequality (30) in terms of y_x gives

$$y_x'' + \frac{1}{p'}(y_x')^2 + K|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2 \le 0, \quad \forall t \in [0,1], \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N, \quad \forall p' \ge p,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(\mathcal{J}^{\frac{1}{p'}})_x'' + \frac{K}{p'}|\dot\gamma_x(t)|^2\mathcal{J}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \le 0, \quad \forall t \in [0,1], \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2} \setminus N, \quad \forall p' \ge p.$$

Classical Sturm comparison results then imply

$$\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(t) \geq \sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\,\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(0) + \sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(|\dot\gamma_x|)\,\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(1), \quad \forall x \in \Sigma_{1/2}\setminus N, \quad \forall t\in[0,1], \quad \forall p' \geq p.$$

□

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 4.1 by combining all the results of this section.

Proof of Theorem 4.1.
(i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii). Given $\mu_0,\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M,\mathcal{H}^p)$ and a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ such that for some $t_0\in(0,1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0}\subset M$, from Lemma 4.7 we know that for every $t\in[0,1]$ the probability measure μ_t is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_t\subset M$. Also, thanks to Theorem 4.3 (see also Remark 4.4), the W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is given by Lipschitz optimal transport maps; more precisely there exist unique Lipschitz maps $T^t_{1/2}:\Sigma_{1/2}\to\Sigma_t$ such that $(T^t_{1/2})_\sharp\mu_{1/2}=\mu_t$ and $\pi_{0,1}:=(T^0_{1/2},T^1_{1/2})_\sharp\mu_{1/2}$ is an optimal coupling between μ_0 and μ_1.
Calling $\gamma_x(\cdot):=T^{(\cdot)}_{1/2}(x)\in\mathrm{Geo}(M)$, note that for every $t\in[0,1]$ one has $\mathsf{d}_x:=|\dot\gamma_x(t)|=\mathsf{d}(T^0_{1/2}(x),T^1_{1/2}(x))$ for $\mu_{1/2}$-a.e. $x\in\Sigma_{1/2}$.
Recalling that we set $\mathcal{J}_x(t):=\det[DT^t_{1/2}(x)]$ for $\mu_{1/2}$-a.e. $x\in\Sigma_{1/2}$ and making use of Lemma 4.9 and Lemma 4.11, we can then compute as follows for every $p'\geq p\geq 1$ and every $t\in(0,1)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Sigma_t}\rho_t(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}d\mu_t(x) &= \int_{\Sigma_{1/2}}\rho_t(T^t_{1/2}(y))^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\,d\mu_{1/2}(y)\\
&\overset{(22)}{=}\int_{\Sigma_{1/2}}\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(t)\,\rho_{1/2}(x)^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}\,d\mathcal{H}^p(x)\\
&\overset{(28)}{\geq}\int_{\Sigma_{1/2}}\Big[\sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(\mathsf{d}_x)\,\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(0)\,\rho_{1/2}(x)^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}+\sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(\mathsf{d}_x)\,\mathcal{J}_x^{\frac{1}{p'}}(1)\,\rho_{1/2}(x)^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}\Big]d\mathcal{H}^p(x)\\
&\overset{(22)}{\geq}\int_{\Sigma_{1/2}}\Big[\sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(\mathsf{d}_x)\rho_0(T^0_{1/2}(x))^{-\frac{1}{p'}}+\sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(\mathsf{d}_x)\rho_1(T^1_{1/2}(x))^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\Big]\rho_{1/2}(x)\,d\mathcal{H}^p(x)\\
&=\int_{M\times M}\Big[\sigma_{K,p'}^{(1-t)}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}+\sigma_{K,p'}^{(t)}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\Big]\,d\pi_{0,1}(x,y).
\end{aligned}$$

(i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii').
The proof os analogous to the proof of (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii') in Theorem 3.1.

(ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i).
Noting that (ii) of Theorem 4.1 implies (ii) of Theorem 3.1, the conclusion follows from the implication (ii) $\Longrightarrow$ (i) in Theorem 3.1. □

5. Applications

The main application of Theorem 4.1 is a refined Brunn-Minkowski inequality involving the $\mathcal{H}^p$-measure and countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable sets. A first refinement is about the measure: the standard Brunn-Minkowski inequality involves the top Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^n$ in an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold. A second refinement is that, in comparison with the standard Brunn-Minkowski inequality where one gives a lower bound on the measure of all intermediate points, here we give more sharply a lower bound on the measure of just the t-intermediate points where the optimal transport is performed (let us mention that this was already the case in [17] even if not explicitly stated, but there one considers the top dimensional Hausdorff measure).

Theorem 5.1 (p-Brunn-Minkowski Inequality)**.** *Let (M,g) be a complete n-dimensional Riemannian manifold and assume that* $\mathrm{Ric}_p\geq K$ *for some $p\in\{1,\dots,n\}$ and $K\in\mathbb{R}$. Let $A_0,A_1\subset M$ be bounded p-rectifiable subsets with positive and finite $\mathcal{H}^p$-measure. Set $\mu_i=\mathcal{H}^p(A_i)^{-1}\mathcal{H}^p\llcorner A_i$ for $i=0,1$ and assume*

that there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ such that for some $t_0 \in (0,1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable subset $\Sigma_{t_0} \subset M$.

Then:

(1) *for every $t \in [0,1]$ one has $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathcal{H}^p \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ and it holds*

$$\mathcal{H}^p\left(\{\rho_t > 0\}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \geq \sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\, \mathcal{H}^p(A_0)^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\, \mathcal{H}^p(A_1)^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad \forall p' \geq p, \tag{31}$$

where

$$\Theta := \begin{cases} \inf\{\mathsf{d}(x,y) : x \in A_0, y \in A_1\} & \text{if } K \geq 0, \\ \sup\{\mathsf{d}(x,y) : x \in A_0, y \in A_1\} & \text{if } K < 0. \end{cases}$$

In particular, calling

$$A_t := \{\gamma(t) \,:\, \gamma \in \mathrm{Geo}(X),\, \gamma(0) \in A_0,\, \gamma(1) \in A_1\}$$

the set of all t-intermediate points of geodesics with endpoints in A_0 and A_1, it holds

$$\mathcal{H}^p(A_t)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \geq \sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\, \mathcal{H}^p(A_0)^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\, \mathcal{H}^p(A_1)^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad \forall p' \geq p. \tag{32}$$

(2) *If $p \geq 2$ and if there exists a smooth p-dimensional submanifold $\bar\Sigma \subset M$ such that μ_t is supported on $\bar\Sigma$ for every $t \in [0,1]$, then in the inequality (32) we can replace the coefficients $\sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)$ by $\tau^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)$.*

Proof. **Proof of (1).**
From Lemma 4.5 we know that for every $t \in [0,1]$ it holds $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathcal{H}^p \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$. Moreover $\mathcal{H}^p\left(\{\rho_t > 0\} \setminus A_t\right) = 0$. Therefore, if we prove (31) then also (32) will follow.
In order to get (31), observe that from Theorem 4.1 the W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{\rho_t>0\}} \rho_t(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} d\mu_t(x) &\geq \int_{M\times M} \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\right] d\pi_{0,1}(x,y), \quad \forall p' \geq p \\ &\geq \sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\, \mathcal{H}^p(A_0)^{\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\Theta)\, \mathcal{H}^p(A_1)^{\frac{1}{p'}}, \quad \forall p' \geq p, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where in the second inequality we used that the coefficients $\sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\theta)$ are non-increasing in $\theta > 0$ for $K \geq 0$ and are instead non-decreasing in $\theta > 0$ for $K < 0$.
On the other hand, from Jensen inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{\rho_t>0\}} \rho_t(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} d\mu_t(x) &= \mathcal{H}^p(\{\rho_t > 0\}) \int_{\{\rho_t>0\}} \rho_t^{1-\frac{1}{p'}}\, d\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{H}^p(\{\rho_t>0\})}\mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \{\rho_t > 0\}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{H}^p(\{\rho_t > 0\}) \left(\int_{\{\rho_t>0\}} \rho_t\, d\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{H}^p(\{\rho_t>0\})}\mathcal{H}^p \llcorner \{\rho_t > 0\}\right)\right)^{1-\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &= \mathcal{H}^p(\{\rho_t > 0\})^{\frac{1}{p'}}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

The combination of (33) and (34) implies (31).

Proof of (2).
The proof of (2) follows verbatim the proof of (1) just making use of (ii)' of Theorem 4.1.

□

Remark 5.2. In (ii)' of Theorem 4.1 and therefore also in (2) of Theorem 5.1, the condition that $\bar\Sigma \subset M$ is a smooth p-dimensional submanifold can be relaxed to ask that $\bar\Sigma$ is a p-rectifiable subset containing all the geodesics where the transport from μ_0 to μ_1 is performed. This observation will be useful in the proof of the p-Bishop Gromov inequality below.

With analogous arguments, using Theorem 1.1 instead of Theorem 4.1, we can prove the following result under sectional curvature lower bounds.

Corollary 5.3 (Brunn-Minkowski under sectional curvature lower bounds)**.** *Let (M,g) be a complete n-dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary satisfying* $\mathrm{Sec} \geq K$*, for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$.*

- *If $K \geq 0$ then* (1) *and* (2) *of Theorem 5.1 hold for every $p \in \{2,\dots,n\}$, with K replaced by $(p-1)K$.*
- *If $K \leq 0$ then* (1) *of Theorem 5.1 holds for every $p \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ and* (2) *holds for every $p \in \{2,\dots,n\}$, in both cases with K replaced by* $\min\{p, n-1\}K$.

To best of our knowledge both Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.3 are original. It seems that even the case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, $p < n$, has not been treated in the literature yet.

As observed in [17], the Brunn-Minkowski inequality implies Bishop-Gromov inequality. We then also get the following result. In order to state it let us denote by $C_x \subset T_xM$ the tangential cut locus, i.e. the subset of T_xM where the exponential map $\exp_x$ is not smooth. Recalling that $\mathcal{H}^n(C_x) = 0$, note that for a.e. p-dimensional plane $P \subset T_xM$ (a.e. with respect to the Lebesgue measure in the Grassmannian of p-planes in $\mathbb{R}^n$) it holds $\mathcal{H}^p(P \cap C_x) = 0$.

Theorem 5.4 (p-Bishop-Gromov inequality)**.** *Let (M,g) be a complete n-dimensional Riemannian manifold and assume that* $\mathrm{Ric}_p \geq K$ *for some $p \in \{2,\dots,n\}$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider a p-plane $P \subset T_xM$ such that $\mathcal{H}^p(P \cap C_x) = 0$ and define $D_r^P(x) = \exp_x(P \cap B_r(0))$, $\partial D_r^P(x) = \exp_x(P \cap \partial B_r(0))$.*

Then, for a.e. $R > r > 0$ ($R, r < \pi\sqrt{\frac{K}{p-1}}$ if $K > 0$), it holds

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}^{p-1}(\partial D_r^P(x))}{\mathcal{H}^{p-1}(\partial D_R^P(x))} \geq \left(\sigma_{K,p-1}^{(r/R)}\right)^{p-1} \quad \left(= \frac{\sin\left(r\sqrt{K/p-1}\right)^{p-1}}{\sin\left(R\sqrt{K/p-1}\right)^{p-1}},\ \text{if } K>0\right). \tag{35}$$

Moreover, for all $R > r > 0$ ($R, r < \pi\sqrt{\frac{K}{p-1}}$ if $K > 0$) it holds

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}^p(D_R^P(x))}{\mathcal{H}^p(D_r^P(x))} \leq \frac{\int_0^R \sin\left(t\sqrt{K/p-1}\right)^{p-1} dt}{\int_0^r \sin\left(t\sqrt{K/p-1}\right)^{p-1} dt}, \tag{36}$$

for $K > 0$, and with usual interpretation of the right hand side for $K \leq 0$.

Proof. First of all notice that for every $r > 0$ the set $D_r^P(x)$ is $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable and

$$\mathcal{H}^{p-1}(\partial D_r^P(x)) = \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon}\mathcal{H}^p(D_{r+\epsilon}^P(x) \setminus D_r^P(x)), \quad \text{for a.e. } r > 0.$$

Consider the Kantorovich potential $\phi(y) = -\,\mathsf{d}(y,x)^2$, fix $R > r > 0$ and $\delta, \varepsilon \in (0, r/10)$; set also $t := r/R$. Clearly, ϕ is smooth away from the cut locus of x and therefore it is smooth $\mathcal{H}^p$-a.e. in $D_R^P(x)$. Note also that $\nabla\phi(y) \in T_y D_R^P(x)$ for $\mathcal{H}^p$-a.e. $y \in D_R^P(x)$. Let $A_0 := D_\varepsilon^P(x)$ and $A_1 := \bar{D}_{R+\delta R}^P(x) \setminus D_R^P(x)$; it is easy to check that $A_t \subset \bar{D}_{r+\delta r+\varepsilon r/R}^P(x) \setminus D_{r-\varepsilon r/R}^P(x)$ and that $R - \varepsilon \leq \Theta \leq R + \delta R + \varepsilon$. Therefore, claim (2) in Theorem 5.1 (see also Remark 5.2) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^p\left(\bar{D}_{r+\delta r+\varepsilon r/R}^P(x) \setminus D_{r-\varepsilon r/R}^P(x)\right)^{1/p} &\geq \tau_{K,p}^{(1-r/R)}(R \pm \delta R \pm \varepsilon)\,\mathcal{H}^p(D_\varepsilon^P(x))^{1/p} \\ &\quad + \tau_{K,p}^{(r/R)}(R \pm \delta R \pm \varepsilon)\,\mathcal{H}^p(\bar{D}_{R+\delta R}^P(x) \setminus D_R^P(x))^{1/p},\end{aligned}$$

where $\pm$ has to be chosen to coincide with the sign of K. Taking the limit for $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}^p(\bar{D}_{r+\delta r}^P(x) \setminus D_r^P(x))^{1/p} \geq \tau_{K,p}^{(r/R)}(R \pm \delta R)\ \mathcal{H}^p(\bar{D}_{R+\delta R}^P(x) \setminus D_R^P(x))^{1/p}. \tag{37}$$

Since $D_r^P(x)$ is a smooth submanifold if $r > 0$ sufficiently small, the left hand side is finite for such small r. Therefore $D_R(x)$ has finite $\mathcal{H}^p$-measure for any $R > 0$. Moreover the map $r \mapsto \mathcal{H}^p(\bar{D}_r^P(x))$ is right continuous and non-decreasing with at most countably many discontinuities. Since such a map is smooth

for small r, (37) implies that it is actually continuous on all $\mathbb{R}^+$ and in particular $\mathcal{H}^p(\partial D_r^P(x)) = 0$ for all $r > 0$. It follows that

(38)

$$\frac{1}{\delta r}\left(\mathcal{H}^p(D^P_{r+\delta r}(x)) - \mathcal{H}^p(D^P_r(x))\right) \geq \frac{1}{\delta R}\left(\mathcal{H}^p(D^P_{R+\delta R}(x)) - \mathcal{H}^p(D^P_R(x))\right) \left(\frac{\sin\left((1\pm\delta)r\sqrt{K/p-1}\right)}{\sin\left((1\pm\delta)R\sqrt{K/p-1}\right)}\right)^{p-1},$$

for $K > 0$, $p > 1$, and with usual interpretation for $K \leq 0$. Taking the limit for $\delta \downarrow 0$ in the previous inequality, we obtain the first claim (35).

Since for small $r > 0$ the map $r \mapsto \mathcal{H}^p(D_r^P(x))$ is Lipschitz continuous, then (38) implies that such a map is locally Lipschitz on $\mathbb{R}^+$, in particular it is differentiable a.e. on $\mathbb{R}^+$ and it coincides with the integral of its a.e. well defined derivative $r \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{p-1}(\partial D_r^P(x))$. The second claim (36) follows then by applying the classical Gromov's trick (see for instance [3, Lemma 3.1]). □

Our characterization of p-Ricci bounds doesn't use any differential structure of the underlying Riemannian manifold. Hence, we propose the following definition.

Definition 5.5. A metric space (X, d_X) has p-Ricci curvature bounded from below by $K \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if the following condition holds.

Let $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(X, \mathcal{H}^p)$ with $\mu_i = \rho_i \mathcal{H}^p$. Assume there exists a W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ between μ_0 and μ_1 such that for some $t_0 \in (0,1)$ the measure μ_{t_0} is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable set $\Sigma_{t_0} \subset X$. Then $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ for every $t \in [0,1]$ and it holds

$$S_{p'}(\mu_t|\mathcal{H}^p) \leq -\int \left[\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_0(x)^{-\frac{1}{p'}} + \sigma^{(t)}_{K,p'}(\mathsf{d}(x,y))\rho_1(y)^{-\frac{1}{p'}}\right] d\pi(x,y), \quad \forall t \in [0,1],\ \forall p' \geq p,$$

where π is the optimal coupling induced by the W_2-geodesic $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$.

Up to minor changes in the proof, it is possible to extend the p-Brunn-Minkowski inequality ((1) in Theorem 5.1) to the metric setting.
We decided to focus the present work to the case of smooth Riemannian manifolds and it goes beyond the scopes of this paper to analyze in depth the spaces satisfying Definition 5.5. Nevertheless we wish to finish by proposing some possible directions for future research.

Remark 5.6 (Open problems). Some open problems that this paper and the last definition suggest are:

(1) Given an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold (M, g) let $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \subset M$ be p-dimensional smooth submanifolds (or more generally countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable subsets), $p < n$, and let $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}_c(M, \mathcal{H}^p)$ be concentrated on Σ_i, $i = 1, 2$. Given $\{\mu_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ a W_2-geodesic from μ_0 to μ_1, investigate under which conditions the measure μ_t is concentrated on a countably $\mathcal{H}^p$-rectifiable subset for some (and then for every, thanks to Lemma 4.7) $t \in (0,1)$. Clearly, a trivial sufficient condition is that there exists a totally geodesic p-dimensional submanifold $\bar{\Sigma}$ such that $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \subset \bar{\Sigma}$, or that the transport is given by Lipschitz optimal maps; are there non trivial necessary/sufficient conditions?
(2) Investigate the various inclusions between the classes of Alexandrov spaces Vs metric spaces with p-Ricci curvature bounded from below (making distinction between positive and negative lower bounds on the curvature); in the case of Ricci curvature lower bounds this was done by Petrunin [14]. It would also be interesting to compare Definition 5.5 with the recent work of Kell [6] on sectional curvature bounds in metric spaces via Busemann functions.
(3) Investigate the stability of the class of metric spaces with p-Ricci curvature bounded from below (under suitable non-collapsing assumptions) under Gromov-Hausdorff convergence.
(4) Find the correct extension of the p-Bishop-Gromov inequality (Theorem 5.4) to the metric setting; note that such extension may give interesting compactness properties of "geodesic" p-strata.

References

[1] L. Ambrosio and N. Gigli, User's guide to optimal transport theory, Modeling and optimization of flows on networks, Lecture Notes in Mathematics (Springer, Berlin, 2013) 1–155.

[2] P. Castillon, Submanifolds, isoperimetric inequalities and optimal transportation, J. Funct. Anal., **259**, (2010), 79–103.

[3] I. Chavel, Riemannian geometry - a modern introduction, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, **108**, Cambridge Univ. Press. (1993).

[4] D. Cordero-Erausquin, R. J. McCann, and M. Schmuckenschläger, A Riemannian interpolation inequality á la Borell, Brascamp and Lieb, Invent. Math. **146**, (2), (2001), 219–257.

[5] W. Gangbo and R. McCann, Shape recognition via Wasserstein distance, Quart. Appl. Math. **58**, (2000), 705–737.

[6] M. Kell, Sectional curvature-type conditions on metric spaces, preprint arXiv:1601.03363.

[7] J. Kitagawa and M. Warren, Regularity for the optimal transportation problem with Euclidean distance squared cost on the embedded sphere, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **44**, (2012), 2871–2887.

[8] J. Lott, On tangent cones and parallel transport in Wasserstein space, Preprint arXiv:1407.7245.

[9] J. Lott and C. Villani, Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport, Ann. of Math. (2) **169** (2009), 903–991.

[10] R.J. McCann, A convexity theory for interacting gases and equilibrium crystals, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, Thesis (Ph.D.)-Princeton University, (1994).

[11] R. McCann and M. Sosio, Hölder continuity for optimal multivalued mappings, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **43**, 4, (2011), 1855–1871.

[12] S.I. Ohta, Finsler interpolation inequalities, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **36**, (2009), 211–249.

[13] P. Petersen and F. Wilhelm, On Frankel's Theorem, Canad. Math. Bull., **46**, (1), (2003), 130–139.

[14] A. Petrunin, Alexandrov meets Lott-Sturm-Villani, Münster J. Math., **4**, (2011), 53–64.

[15] Z.M. Shen, On complete manifolds of nonnegative kth-Ricci curvature, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **338**, (1), (1993), 289–310.

[16] K.T. Sturm, On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I, Acta Math., **196**, (2006), 133–177.

[17] K.T. Sturm, On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II, Acta Math., **196**, (2006), 133–177.

[18] K.T. Sturm and M.K. von Renesse, Transport inequalities, gradient estimates, entropy, and Ricci curvature, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **58**, (2005), 923–940.

[19] C. Villani, Optimal transport. Old and new, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, **338**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2009).

[20] F. Wilhelm, On intermediate Ricci curvature and fundamental groups, Illinois Journ. of Math., **41**, (3), (1997), 488–494.

[21] H. Wu, Manifolds of partially positive curvature, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **36**, (3), (1987), 525–548.

[22] H.W. Xu and F. Ye, Differentiable sphere theorems for submanifolds of positive k-th Ricci curvature, Manuscripta Math., **138**, (3-4), (2012), 529–543.